

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. Claims 2, 7, 17, 24 are cancelled herein. Claims 1, 11, 16 and 23 are independent claims. Claims 1-29 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3, 16, 17, 23, 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fitzsimons et al. hereinafter Fitzsimons (US 2004/0205452).

Regarding claim 1, the examiner maintains that Fitzsimons discloses a method for transforming data as claimed and cites Fitzsimons paragraphs [0020], [0048], [0070], [0073], and Figure 2 as teaching all of the claimed elements. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Fitzsimons fails to teach the elements arranged as recited in the claims. See MPEP § 2131.01. (Requiring that “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim....”) In this instance the examiner cited to one part of the reference as teaching pointers, another part of the reference as teaching storage and another part of the reference as teaching software components. However, those elements are not arranged in Fitzsimons as required by the claim.

Additionally, Applicant has amended the claim to more clearly set forth the claimed invention. For example, claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

passing the first set of pointers to the data in the buffer to a first component in order for the first component to apply a first transform to the at least one column in the plurality of rows directly in the buffer;

passing the first set of pointers to the data in the buffer to a second component in order for the second component to apply a second transform to the at least one column in the plurality of rows directly in the buffer;

Fitzsimons simply does not teach passing sets of pointers to a buffer to apply transforms to columns of data as is claimed. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection

Similar analysis was applied to independent claims 16 and 23. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of those claims as well.

Inasmuch as claims 2, 3, 17, and 24 depend from independent claims 1, 16 and 23, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection as to those claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 4-13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons (US 2004/0205452), in view of Carosso et al (US 4,783,760).

Regarding claims 4-10, 18-22, and 25-29, Applicant submits that they depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of their respective independent base claims. As such, Applicant submits that the analysis above applies with respect to the independent claims 1, 16, and 23. In addition, the addition of Carosso does not cure the deficiency of Fitzsimons. Carosso is generally directed to word processing and not transforming columns in rows of data as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4-10, 18-22, and 25-29 also patentably define over Fitzsimons in view of Carosso.

Regarding independent claim 11, the examiner maintains that Fitzsimons did not disclose creating a plurality of pointers wherein each pointer uniquely points to a single row of data from among the plurality of rows of data in the buffer. However, the examiner maintains that the general concept of creating a plurality of pointers wherein each pointer uniquely points to a single row of data from among the plurality of rows of data in the buffer is well known in the art as taught by Carosso. Applicants respectfully disagree that Fitzsimons in view of Carosso teach all of the claim limitations of claim 11. For example, claim 11 recites:

passing the plurality of pointers to a plurality of transformation
objects in a path, wherein each transformation object applies a
transformation to the data in series

Neither Fitzsimons nor Carosso teach passing the plurality of pointed to transformation objects in a path as is claimed. The examiner points to paragraph [0103] of Fitzsimons as teaching this limitation. However, Fitzsimons teaches nothing of transformation objects in a path and said nothing about applying a transformation in series or passing pointers among transformation objects.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 11, patently defines over Fitzsimon in view of Carosso.

Inasmuch as claims 12, 13 and 15 depend from claim 11, Applicants submit that they also patentably define over Fitzsimon in view of Carosso for at least the same reasons.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons (US 2004/0205452), in view of Carosso et al (US 4,783,760) and further in view of Gerard (US 6,023,704).

Inasmuch as claim 14 depends from claim 11, Applicants submit that it also patentably define over Fitzsimon in view of Carosso for at least the same reasons as analyzed above with respect to claim 11.

CONCLUSION

In the view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative.

Date: June 12, 2008

/Michael J. Swope/
Michael J. Swope
Registration No. 38,041

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439